

GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

ABSTRACT

The A.P. Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Dacoits, Drug Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders and Land Grabbers Act, 1986 (Act No.1 of 1986) Chittoor District – Order of detention passed by the Collector & District Magistrate, Ranga Reddy in respect of Sri Sri Rudraram Srinivas Goud @ Edigi Srinivas Goud, S/o. Ramaiah, aged about 36 years, R/o. Navalga Village of Basheerabad Mandal, Ranga Reddy District – Representation of Smt. Rudraram Anitha, wife of the detenu and the detenu - Rejected – Orders- Issued.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (LAW AND ORDER.II) DEPARTMENT

G.O.Rt.No. 2525

Dated:22.05.2010

Read the following:-

- 1.From the Collector & District Magistrate, Ranga Reddy, Letter Rc.No.A2/414/2010, dated 29.03.2010.
- 2.G.O.Rt.No.1931, G.A. (L&O.II) Dept., dt. 22-4-2010
- 3.Repn., of Smt. A. Anitha, W/o.Srinivas Goud @ Edigi Srinivas Goud. Dt. 4-4-2010.
- 4.Representation of Sri Rudraram Srinivas Goud, Detenu, Dt.Nil.

O R D E R:

In the order first read above, the Collector & District Magistrate, Ranga Reddy has passed detention order under Act No.1 of 1986 against Sri Rudraram Srinivas Goud @ Edigi Srinivas Goud, S/o. Ramaiah, aged about 36 years, R/o. Navalga Village of Basheerabad Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, in view of his involvement in COR Nos. 526/08-09, 894/08-09, 906/08-09, 943/08-09 and 902/09-10, dt. 12-11-2008, 15-3-2009, 17-3-2009, 31-3-2009 and 5-3-2009 respectively for having repeatedly indulging in illegal manufacture, storage and sale of Adulterated Toddy mixed with Chloral hydrate in contravention of A.P. Excise Act, 1968 and also to prevent him from indulging in such activities which is prejudicial to the maintenance of public order. In the G.O. second read above, Government confirmed the order of detention under the provisions of Sec. 12(1) r/w. Section 13 of the said Act.

2. In the representation third read above, Smt. Rudraram Anitha, wife of the detenu, has contended inter alia that in the grounds of detention it was mentioned that the five cases referred to above were booked against the detenu under sections 34(A) and 37(A) of AP Excise Act 1968, But there are no sections 34(A) and 37(A) and only sections 34(a) and 37(a) are provided in the said Act; that once the charge sheets are filed in the cases booked against the detenu, the detention of the detenu considering the cases of CORs., without mentioning contents of charge sheets in the grounds of detention, is bad, illegal and not sustainable; that the first five events have no close and continuous link and proximity so as to provide rational nexus between the incidents relied on, and the satisfaction arrived at and therefore detention of the detenu is illegal and unsustainable. Hence she has requested to revoke the order of detention and to release her husband and set him at his liberty.

3. In the repn. fourth read above addressed to the Advisory Board, the detenu, Sri Rudraram Srinivas Goud @ Edigi Srinivas Goud, S/o. Ramaiah, has contended inter alia that all the five cases booked against him are false cases; that there is long gap of time from the first four cases and the last case; that he is having wife, two daughters and aged parents, his presence is required to lookafter them and requested for his release.

(P.T.O.)

4. After careful consideration of both the representation, Government observes that there is no dispute with regard to the number of cases booked against the detenu under A.P. Excise Act, and their Nos. It is a fact that the sections booked against the detenu under A.P. Excise Act in all the five cases have been shown as 34(A) and 37(A) erroneously instead of 34(a) and 37(a) which is a typographic mistake. The detaining authority having satisfied that the detenu has been repeatedly involving in bootlegging activity on the evidence of five cases booked against him and accordingly the details of each case (CORs) were shown as grounds of his detention. There is no need to go into the details of charge sheets in each case. In the reports of chemical examination of samples, in respect of all the five cases, it was reported that the 'Todd' was adulterated with Chloral Hydrate. The cases quoted in the grounds of detention are within the reasonable proximity. Hence, there are no merits in both the representations. Accordingly, Government hereby reject both the representations putforth by Smt. Aniitha, wife of the detenu, and the detenu.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

R.M.GONELA
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (POLL)

To

Sri Rudraram Srinivas Goud @ Edigi Srinivas Goud, through the Superintendent, Central Prison, Cherlapalli, Ranga Reddy Dist.

Copy to:-

The Superintendent, Cherlapalli, Ranga Reddy District. (He should serve the Order on the detenu immediately under proper acknowledgement and arrange to read over and explain the contents of the same in the language known to the detenu and report compliance to the Government forthwith)

The Collector & District Magistrate, R.R. District.. at Hyderabad.

The Prohibition & Excise Superintendent, Rajendranagar, R.R. Dist.

Sf/sc

//FORWARDED:: BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER